

# **INCORPORATING POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS INTO DEPARTMENTAL STANDARD OPERATING GUIDELINES**

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT

BY: David Matthew  
Sedgwick County Fire Department  
Wichita, Kansas

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy  
as part of the Executive Fire Officer Program

December 2001

## ABSTRACT

The problem was that the Sedgwick County Fire Department (SCFD) did not perform consistent and effective analysis of its emergency operations. A standardized process for conducting Post Incident Analysis (PIA) had not been adopted. The purpose of this applied research project is to establish a standardized process of PIA for SCFD. The researcher of this project used evaluative and action research methodology to answer the following questions:

1. What are the existing national and Kansas standards for PIA?
2. What standards are other similar fire departments using for PIA?
3. What criteria should SCFD use for PIA?

The procedures that were followed in this research project started at the National Fire Academy (NFA) Learning Resource Center (LRC). A thorough search for information on post incident analysis or critiques from federal regulations, professional standards, published books, periodicals, and completed EFOP papers was performed. The LRC staff was utilized to access all possible data. The search resulted in locating the following: *Occupational Safety and Health Administration* (OSHA) regulations, *National Fire Protection Association* (NFPA) standards, 48 periodicals, and 12 Executive Fire Officers Program (EFOP) Applied Research Projects on the subject matter. OSHA and NFPA had requirements for conducting PIAs in certain instances. All of the periodicals and EFOP papers recognized the value of conducting PIAs and supported the process. The positive and the negative aspects concerning the conducting of PIAs were evaluated by the researcher.

The research revealed that 24% of the paid fire departments in Kansas had PIA incorporated into their Standard Operating Guidelines (SOGs). An Internal Feedback form revealed strong support from members of SCFD for conducting PIAs. The researcher developed

a PIA procedure from the results of the research and submitted it to the SCFD SOG committee for adoption. It is the recommendation of the researcher that standardized procedures be incorporated into departmental SOGs to insure maximum benefit of the PIA process.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**ABSTRACT ..... 2**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... 4**

**INTRODUCTION ..... 5**

**BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE ..... 5**

**LITERATURE REVIEW ..... 6**

**PROCEDURES ..... 8**

**RESULTS .....11**

**DISCUSSION .....12**

**RECOMMENDATIONS .....14**

**REFERENCES .....15**

**APPENDIX A (Feedback Instrument).....17**

**APPENDIX B (Results of Feedback Instrument, including comments).....20**

**APPENDIX C (Kansas fire departments studied for PIA procedures).....23**

**APPENDIX D (Post Incident Analysis Standard Operating Guideline).....26**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The problem is the Sedgwick County Fire Department (SCFD) is not conducting consistent, effective, and comprehensive Post Incident Analysis (PIA) of its emergency operations. The purpose of this research is to evaluate the need for SCFD to adopt PIA into its standard operating guidelines (SOG). This research project will use both evaluative and action research. The questions to be answered are:

1. What are the existing national and Kansas standards for PIA?
2. What procedures are other similar fire departments using for PIA?
3. What criteria should SCFD use for PIA?

## **BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE**

Established in 1954, the Sedgwick County Fire Department (SCFD) has never had a formal PIA process. SCFD currently has 136 full time employees with eight stations making over six thousand responses annually. According to Brunacini (1991a) “Regular and well-managed critiques are necessary to improve firefighting performance”. The National Fire Academy’s (NFA) Executive Fire Officer Program (EFOP) had 12 applied research projects on file at the Learning Research Center (LRC) on the subject of PIAs. Although the research questions differed, each project recognized the value of performing PIA. With no standardization and documentation, SCFD is not benefiting fully from the Post Incident Analysis process.

This study is important for SCFD for two reasons. First, a standardized PIA will help current members learn from the experiences of their peers through participation in the PIA process. The distributions of the PIA results will allow all members of SCFD to access the findings. Second, the proper documentation of the PIAs will allow for future members of SCFD

to learn from their predecessors. This historical record of past lessons learned will allow them the opportunity to copy past successes and avoid repeating the mistakes.

This Applied Research Project follows the nine-step research process outlined in the NFA's *Executive Development* course (NFA, 1997). The researcher feels that the value of performing PIAs has been established by previous EFOP applied research projects. This research builds on these projects and will explore the requirements for conducting PIAs and what criteria should be included in the PIA process for SCFD. The results will help determine what kind of PIA process will be adopted by SCFD. The incorporation PIAs into SOGs will have a significant impact on future operations for any response agency that incorporates its concepts.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The purpose of this literature review is to set the foundation for PIAs to be incorporated into departmental SOGs. There are three questions to be answered. First, what are the existing national and Kansas standards for PIA? Second, what standards are other similar fire departments using for PIA? Finally, what criteria should the Sedgwick County Fire Department (SCFD) use for PIA?

To research existing national standards, *Occupational Safety and Health Administration* (OSHA) and the *National Fire Protection Association* (NFPA) documents were reviewed. The OSHA *Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response* (HAZWOPER) regulation contains requirements for conducting a critique following incidents involving Hazardous Materials (OSHA, 2001). This requirement is also in the NFPA standards for *Responding to Hazardous Materials Incidents* (NFPA 472, 1997; NFPA 473, 1997). The NFPA also has requirements for conducting PIAs in *Fire Department Occupational Safety and Health Program* (NFPA 1500, 1997) which includes the requirement that the fire department Safety Officer be

involved in the process. PIA requirements for Technical Rescue responses are covered in NFPA 1006 (2000). These were current requirements as of the writing of this paper.

To research the state of Kansas requirements for conducting PIAs the Kansas State Fire Marshals Office (KSFM) was contacted. Elena Nuss from the KSFM advised that no requirements existed for fire departments to conduct PIAs (personal communication, November 26, 2001).

When researching what other similar fire departments were doing concerning PIA, the researcher found that 11 Kansas fire departments had a formal PIA procedure that was incorporated into their department's SOGs. Eight of these departments provided a copy of their PIA procedures to the researcher. Several stated they had set procedures but felt that theirs needed improvement and did not provide written documents. Additionally, seven procedures from fire departments outside the state of Kansas were provided from professional contacts of the researcher. All of the PIA procedures received contained many of the key points recommended by professional publications.

Finally, to answer the question what criteria should SCFD use for PIA, a thorough search of published books, periodicals, and completed EFOP projects was made at the Learning Resource Center (LRC) at the NFA. Brunacini (1991a) defined the characteristics of an effective critique to be; "consistent and timely, well packaged and well attended, open and constructive, based on established procedures, focus on lessons learned, strong facilitation, and department wide distribution". In addition, Cook (1998) provides a sample procedure for a critique as incorporated into Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). Cook's format covers Scope, Definitions, Procedures, and Responsibilities. English (2000), in his EFOP project, describes eleven key components of PIAs. Those components are; "clear policies and procedures,

designate who will conduct the analysis, all responding personnel should be included, establish goals and objectives of the analysis, review incident records, reports from personnel on the incident, open discussion, recommendations for improvement, and analysis of findings.” Those copies of PIA procedures collected from other departments were also evaluated for these components.

In summary, the research revealed the existence of federal regulations and national standards for conducting PIAs. The state of Kansas has not adopted any specific requirements, however, 24% of the Kansas departments studied have standardized procedures for conducting PIAs. Published materials discussed the value, characteristics, and components of effective PIA. Finally, the copies of other department’s procedures offered a template to follow.

## **PROCEDURES**

To answer question one regarding existing national and Kansas standards for PIA, the researcher reviewed current regulations and literature from nationally recognized organizations at the Learning Research Center (LRC) in Emmitsburg, Maryland. Relevant materials from the *Occupational Safety and Healthy Administration* (OSHA) and the *National Fire Protection Association* (NFPA) were reviewed. To explore the state of Kansas requirements, Elana Nuss of the Kansas State Fire Marshals Office, reviewed the Kansas statutes.

To address question two, regarding what other similar fire departments are doing, all Kansas fire departments with more than 10 paid employees were contacted by telephone or e-mail by the researcher. They were asked if PIA was incorporated into their SOGs. Of the 49 departments in the study, only 47 participated, revealing that 11 departments incorporated PIA procedures into their SOGs. These departments were requested to forward a copy by fax or e-mail and eight procedures were actually received. Through professional contacts of the



researcher, a convenience sample of fire departments from outside of Kansas provided seven additional PIA procedures for this study.

For question three, regarding what criteria should SCFD use for PIA, the researcher utilized the LRC staff to identify those periodicals, books and published EFOP projects that contained information on post incident analysis or critiques. The expertise and professionalism of Beth Tredinnicki, of the LRC staff, gave the researcher confidence that a comprehensive search was conducted. Secondly, a feedback instrument was distributed to all 130 operational members of SCFD (Appendix A). Information gathered during the literary search was utilized in developing the feedback instrument. Lastly, sample PIA forms received from other fire departments were reviewed by several SCFD members to provide feedback to the researcher. This feedback was essential in developing a PIA SOG for SCFD.

### **Feedback Form**

A feedback instrument was developed to gather data on what items should be contained in a PIA as well as the expected results from conducting PIAs. The feedback form was developed by the researcher, and distributed to all operational members of SCFD in a written communication through the Safety/Training Division (Appendix A). Division Chief, Rick Brazil, reviewed and signed the feedback instrument. There were 50 entries in the comment section of the forms (Appendix B). To provide an accurate representation of the respondents attitude towards PIA, all written comments were included in the report.

### **Statistical Analysis**

Evaluative statistics were used to rank the responses based on the number of feedback forms returned. There were 104 forms returned out of a possible 130, for a participation rate of 80%. The ranking scale on the feed back form was as follows; (4) essential, (3) strongly support,

(2) moderately support, (1) no support, and (0) strongly against. The respondents entered the numerical designation that best indicated their opinion next to each item on the form. The questions were employed in a forced choice format. The higher the number given indicated the most support. The data was entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to track and total each item. The total score for each item was divided by the total number of forms received, 104, to indicate the overall average response to that item (Appendix B). Since the numerical designation of three was assigned to “strongly support” on the feedback form, any item whose response totaled more than 312 points indicated that the average response to that item fell between “strongly support” to “essential”.

### **Limitations and Assumptions**

Respondents to the survey may not have been aware of federal, state and local standards for PIA and no attempt was made to make them aware of the standards. The respondents based their feedback on their own knowledge and personal opinion. It is assumed that the respondents were forthright in their responses.

The OSHA regulations and NFPA standards were the focus of the researcher in defining what the national standards for PIA are. It is assumed that additional requirements may exist by other federal and professional organizations.

This research is limited by the small number of Kansas fire departments studied and by the lesser representation of departments outside of Kansas. A national survey would strengthen the findings.

### **Definition of Terms**

Post Incident Analysis (PIA) – A group discussion by the participants involved in an Incident. Discussion points include the actions taken, the results of those actions, what went

right and wrong, and what can be done better. For the purpose of this project the term PIA is used synonymously with Critique.

Standard Operating Guidelines (SOGs)- Those written procedures that personnel of a department are held accountable to follow. For this project SOGs are used synonymously with Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

Similar departments- The fire departments included in the research were considered similar to SCFD by being a Kansas fire department with more than 10 paid personnel. Those fire departments outside of Kansas, that shared PIA procedures through the convenience sample, are comparable to SCFD in being progressive departments who have sent members for training at the NFA.

## **RESULTS**

The review of national standards on PIAs revealed that OSHA and NFPA had requirements for conducting PIAs. The state of Kansas statutes revealed no requirements existed for fire departments to conduct PIAs.

The results of research on what other similar Kansas fire departments were doing revealed that 11 (24%) out of 45 had standardized procedures for conducting PIA. Of the 47 departments in Kansas, 45 (96%) were contacted (Appendix C). The researcher received eight different PIA procedures from the 11 departments contacted that had PIA incorporated into their SOGs. The convenience sample provided seven additional procedures through professional contacts of the researcher from fire departments from six different states outside of Kansas.

The results of the research on what SCFD should use for PIA process utilized information from 48 periodicals, 12 Executive Fire Officers Program (EFOP) Applied Research Projects, and

the feedback instrument. All of the EFOP papers recognized the value of conducting PIAs and supported the process.

The feedback instrument resulted in valuable data for building a PIA procedure for SCFD. Nine items on the feedback form received a total score of greater than 312 points. This indicated that those items average score fell between “strongly support” to “essential”, as defined on the feedback form. The PIA procedure developed for SCFD by the researcher incorporated these nine items .

The researcher developed a PIA procedure from the results of the research and submitted it to the SCFD SOG Committee for adoption (Appendix D). Through feedback received by SCFD staff members, the researcher is confident that PIAs will be incorporated into SCFD SOGs by the spring of 2002.

## **DISCUSSION**

The goal of this applied research project is that SCFD will have a standardized PIA process adopted into it’s SOGs. When adopting any procedure a department needs to constructively assess the positives and negatives of the procedure. The researcher reviewed all the material with this in mind. The following are the researchers findings.

Positive impact for the organization from conducting PIAs was found throughout the research. Baker (1997) stated, “Nearly all fire service representatives conclude that critique use may be the best method to enhance performance”. Dr. Harry Carter (2001) outlines how PIAs can impact a fire department training program. He states, “The Fire Ground can become the Training Ground” when PIA procedures are implemented. Friend (1995) writes, “The findings of this research indicates that rewards were reaped in high morale of employees when PIA are conducted in a positive way.” These results were the expectation of the researcher.

The research provided few examples of the negatives of PIA. Baker (1997) explored the “merits and shortcomings” of PIA, stating the process had “significant negative baggage”. The manner in which a PIA is performed determines positive or negative results according to Baker.

The exposure of legal liabilities is a concern that the researcher addressed. Hermann (1994) states, “The fear of litigation is sort of like worrying about being struck by a meteorite.” Professor Vincent M. Brannigan, NFA EFOP legal expert, stated that he was unaware of any case law where a fire department was held liable for issues arising from the conducting of PIA (personal communication, June 28, 2001). A review of fire service legal publications revealed no mention of increased liability or case law related to the findings from PIA (Schneid 1997; Hogan 2000). The researcher was expecting to find more data on the negatives of conducting PIAs.

It is the researcher’s conclusion that a formal PIA process, that follows the criteria outlined by the research, is justified. This research revealed that the positive impact of a standardized PIA process dwarfs the negatives. Incorporation of a PIA process into departmental SOGs will provide the basis for standardization and consistency needed to get the desired results. Brunacini (1991b) writes, “Without SOPs, a fire critique becomes a free-for-all of personalities and opinions.” This kind of counter-productive PIA is what must be avoided.

SCFD is currently experiencing the effects from lack of standardization when PIAs are conducted. With the adoption of a well-designed and implemented PIA procedure, SCFD will experience improved operations, increased morale, more effective training, and better documentation of lessons learned. These benefits will impact the organization now and in the future.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Researcher recommends that SCFD adopt a SOG for PIA. The literature documented the requirements from national regulations and standards for conducting PIA. National publications, similar fire departments, and members of SCFD provided support for this recommendation. The researcher developed a PIA SOG using information from the literature, sample SOG's, and the feedback instrument (Appendix D). The PIA procedure was submitted to the SCFD SOG Committee for approval.

Future readers of this document should be able to use this research for justification and criteria for developing and implementing a standardized PIA process.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, B. B. (1997). Using the incident critique effectively. Applied Research Project. National Fire Academy, Emmitsburg, MD.
- Brunacini, A. V. (1991a, May/June). Critiques make improvements happen. *NFPA Journal*, pp. 152-153.
- Brunacini, A., V. (1991b, July/August). Critiquing show time yields valuable lessons. *NFPA Journal*, pp. 105-106.
- Carter, H. H. (2001, February). Post-operation critiques. *Firehouse*, pp. 64, 66-67.
- Cook, J. L. (1998). *Standard operating procedures and guidelines*, pp. 164-165. Saddle Brook, NJ: Fire Engineering Books & Videos.
- English, D. L. (2000, October). A description of incident analysis programs for the Rocky Mount Fire Department. Applied Research Project. National Fire Academy, Emmitsburg, MD
- Friend, D. A. (1995, June). Post incident analysis. Applied Research Project. National Fire Academy, Emmitsburg, MD.
- Hermann, S. (1994, March-April). Haz-mat matters: Critiquing hazardous materials incidents. *9-1-1 Magazine*, p.46.
- Hogan, L. J. (2000). *Legal aspects of the fire service*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Amlex, Inc. Frederick, MD.
- National Fire Academy. (1997, June). *Executive development; student manual*, Unit 3: Author.
- National Fire Protection Association. (2000). *Standard for Rescue Technician Professional Qualifications*, NFPA 1006-3-2.7. Quincy, MA: Author.

National Fire Protection Association. (1997). *Fire Department Occupational Safety and Health Program*, NFPA 1500-6-8. Quincy, MA: Author.

National Fire Protection Association. (1997). *Professional Competence of Responders to Hazardous Materials Incidents*, NFPA 472-5-5.3. Quincy MA: Author.

National Fire Protection Association. (1997). *Competencies for EMS Personnel Responding to Hazardous Materials Incidents*, NFPA 473-3-5.1. Quincy, MA: Author.

Occupational Safety Health Administration. (2001, June). Hazardous waste operations and emergency response, OSHA 1910.120 (q)(11)(i),(I)(2)(x). Washington, DC: Author.

Schneid, T. D. (1997). *Fire and emergency law casebook*. Delmar Publishers, Albany, NY.



## **APPENDIX A**

### **FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT**

**SEDGWICK COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT (SCFD)**  
**FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT**  
**(INTERNAL)**

This feedback instrument has been prepared to gather data on requirements for a standardized Post Incident Analysis (PIA) for SCFD. All members of SCFD are requested to fill out the feedback form. Our intent is to use the information gathered to standardize and improve criteria for PIA as we evaluate the need to adopt it into our Standard Operating Guidelines. We are researching what other comparable fire departments have adopted and the national requirements for PIA. We value your opinion and will share the results if requested.

Do not put your name on the feedback instrument so the results can remain anonymous. **Please return the completed form the shift you receive it in the envelope provided.** The process should take no more than 5 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rick Brazill  
Division Chief; Safety/Training Division

**SEDGWICK COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT  
FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT  
(INTERNAL)**

Please complete the post incident analysis feedback instrument by numbering those items/criteria using the following scoring systems.

- 0-----Strongly against**  
**1-----No support**  
**2-----Moderately support**  
**3-----Strongly support**  
**4-----Essential**

**Items Contained in a PIA**

**Expected results from using PIA.s**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral facilitator                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Promotes communications            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Open discussion format               | <input type="checkbox"/> Improve future incident operations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preset questions to be answered      | <input type="checkbox"/> Promotes accountability            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of lessons learned     | <input type="checkbox"/> Positives enhanced                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Findings distributed Department wide | <input type="checkbox"/> Negatives discussed                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Based on standard procedures         | <input type="checkbox"/> Rumor control                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Consistency from PIA to PIA          | <input type="checkbox"/> Solutions explored                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Key players required too attend      | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____                        |

Additional comments/suggestions:

---



---



---



---

## **APPENDIX B**

### **FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT RESULTS**

Date: September 23, 2001  
 To: Division Chief Rick Brazill  
 From: David Matthew  
 Subject: PIA Feedback results

Dear Chief Brazill,

The following are the results from the Post Incident Analysis (PIA) feedback forms that were distributed in August. There were 104 forms returned out of a possible 130 for a participation rate of 80 percent. The data was entered in an excel spreadsheet. The questions that received the highest number indicated the most support. There were 50 entries in the comment section of the forms. All the comments are included in this report.

As part of my Applied Research Project, I will be investigating the PIA process as a part of fire departments Standard Operating Guidelines (SOG). The results from the feedback form will be valuable in this process. I am continuing to gather PIA forms from other Fire Departments and have completed literary research on the subject area. I have also completed research on Federal and State requirements on PIAs.

The PIA feedback form results should be made available to members of the department who wish to see them. I appreciate your willingness to support this research and hope it is useful toward an improved PIA process.

	Questions	Results
Most supported	Key Players required to attend	358
Tie	Solutions explored	352
Tie	Open discussion format	352
	Improve future incident operations	342
	Consistency from PIA to PIA	341
Tie	Promotes communication	327
Tie	Positives enhanced	327
	Negatives discussed	324
	Neutral facilitator	316
	Promotes accountability	311
	Rumor control	308
	Documentation of lessons learned	269
	Based on standard procedures	251
	Findings distributed Department wide	245
Least supported	Preset questions to be answered	221

#### Comments:

- Person in (was) command should NEVER be the facilitator
- Keep to less than 1 hour
- Must set criteria for when PIA are to be done

- Hindsight is always 20/20. Someone with an axe to grind should not use this to get even. IE with holding promotion based on one incident. Sometimes our memory is only as long as one incident.
- Don't waste our time by NOT using this feedback form.
- If Tactics and Strategy are screwed up, Point it out, admit the mistake and move on.
- Too many PIAs end up with all "ATTA BOYS" and no mistakes or negatives are ever pointed out or brought up.
- We have all made mistakes, good PIAs with published results may eliminate the same mistake being made multiple times.
- PIAs should be used in a manner to which it is a positive tool. It should also help to improve our service to the public.
- A PIA is only useful if everyone is honest about how the call went. This should be done without placing blame for negatives.
- Preset questions should pertain to Dept. Procedures. Did we or did we not follow procedures.
- Officers working the incident should meet before PIA (good or bad) to brief themselves.
- Should take place ASAP after incident.
- Should take place within 1 or 2 shifts following incident.
- Quit killing trees for stuff like this.
- No finger pointing, just the facts, and what can make them better.
- Whatever
- Don't be so worried about hurting someone's feelings.
- Negatives need to be talked out and not hidden. So that everybody can learn from them.
- Use as a learning tool
- Personal accountability for actions or lack of actions needs to be addressed and people need to accept responsibility.
- This idea has not been executed as planned/proposed in the past.
- It is a good idea if it is implemented, as it should and not half way.
- It should show department down falls as well as exceeding expectations/training.
- Learning experience, not a witch-hunt.
- Need to be done more often.
- Lot of calls are not being done.
- PIAs can help our younger members and older members learn better techniques to use and not to use the bad ones.
- Use no names of individuals on the Dept. Copies to the stations.
- We need more training on this.
- Train more key players to help out and have a different outlook on what goes on.
- Get our people more interested about PIAs.
- PIAs are VERY worthwhile- should be a MUST.
- Rating the "negatives discussed" low is imperative as to not turn an analysis of incident into a critique.
- Put out as a Document format for all to see, comparing it to Accident Review Board would not be encouraged.
- Gary Denny used a good format.
- A PIA should be a positive experience, negative should be to a minimum.
- If possible, all players should be involved.
- Do more PIAs.
- We could use the smaller fires to get practice for the larger more involved fire/rescue calls.
- I support documentation and the findings to be distributed as long as it is kept anonymous.
- There is no need to point fingers during a PIA.
- Just keep it standard and use it on all incidents until it is better understood.
- Then we can start to utilize it for bigger incidents only.
- Need to use it more often to understand its uses and needs.
- Look at CISD guideline as a format
- Have only been involved in one and it wasn't called a PIA. Was satisfied at that time and I don't feel like I am educated about the critique at this time to lend comments.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **KANSAS FIRE DEPARTMENTS STUDIED**

FIRE DEPARTMENT NAME	CITY	FD PHONE	Contact Person	#PAID FF	PIA SOG
ARKANSAS CITY FIRE/EMS DEPT	ARKANSAS CITY	316-441-4430	Ed Moore	25	No
ATCHISON FIRE DEPARTMENT	ATCHISON	913-367-4329	Lee Kipple	20	No
AUGUSTA-BU CO FIRE DIST 2	AUGUSTA	316-775-4500	David Pate	22	No
CONSOLIDATED FIRE DIST 2 JO CO	PRAIRIE VILLAGE	913-432-1105	Ron Graham	65	No
DODGE CITY FIRE DEPT	DODGE CITY	316-225-8187	Dan Williamson	24	No
EL DORADO FIRE DEPARTMENT	EL DORADO	316-321-9100	Rick Whiteside	12	No
EMPORIA FIRE DEPARTMENT	EMPORIA	316-343-4230	Bob Binder	52	No
FORBES FIELD MTAA FIRE DEPT	TOPEKA	785-862-9250	Rita Irvin	19	No
FORD CO FIRE DEPT	DODGE CITY	316-227-4575	Linda Smith	23	Yes
FORT SCOTT FIRE DEPT	FORT SCOTT	316-223-2140	Jeff Davis	13	No
GARDEN CITY FIRE DEPT	GARDEN CITY	316-276-1140	Allen Shelton	20	No
GARDNER PUBLIC SAFETY DEPT	GARDNER	913-856-7312	Kenneth A. Francis	18	No
GEARY CO RURAL FIRE DEPT	JUNCTION CITY	913-238-2261	Bill Deppish	23	?
GREAT BEND FIRE DEPT	GREAT BEND	316-793-4141	Rick Diebert	29	No
HAYS FIRE AND INSPECTION SVCS	HAYS	785-628-7330	Dave Leikam	22	No
HUTCHINSON FIRE DEPARTMENT	HUTCHINSON	316-694-2871	Kim Shelton	77	Yes
INDEPENDENCE FIRE DEPT	INDEPENDENCE	316-332-2504	Shane Wallis	16	No
IOLA FIRE DEPARTMENT	IOLA	316-365-4972	Wacey Douglas	17	No
JOHNSON CO FIRE DIST #2	STILWELL	913-681-2764	Jim Francis	41	Yes
JOHNSON COUNTY FIRE DIST #1	GARDNER	913-782-3258	Dennis Mcguire	14	No
JUNCTION CITY FIRE DEPARTMENT	JUNCTION CITY	785-238-6822	Mike Younkin	47	Yes
KANSAS CITY KS FIRE DEPT	KANSAS CITY	913-573-5550	Pedros Banos	374	No
LARNED STATE HOSPITAL F D	LARNED	316-285-2131	Jerry Glenn	18	No
LAWRENCE/DG CO FIRE & MEDICAL	LAWRENCE	785-832-7600	Shaun Coffey	137	Yes
LEAVENWORTH FIRE DEPT	LEAVENWORTH	913-682-3346	Walter Terron	48	Yes
LEAWOOD FIRE DEPARTMENT	LEAWOOD	913-339-6700	Ben Florance	45	No
LENEXA FIRE DEPARTMENT	LENEXA	913-888-6380	Lonney Lewis	71	Yes
LEONARDVILLE FIRE DEPT	LEONARDVILLE	913-293-5679	Cloyde Hunter	11	?
LIBERAL FIRE DEPARTMENT	LIBERAL	316-626-0128	Kelly Kirk	15	No
MANHATTAN FIRE DEPARTMENT	MANHATTAN	785-587-4500	Arlen Lector	61	No
MCPHERSON FIRE DEPARTMENT	MCPHERSON	316-245-2505	Dennis Thrower	18	No
MERRIAM FIRE DEPARTMENT	MERRIAM	913-432-7058	Jerry Montgomery	16	No
NEWTON FIRE DEPARTMENT	NEWTON	316-284-6065	Dean Davis	42	No
OLATHE FIRE DEPARTMENT	OLATHE	913-782-4500	George Bentley	86	Yes
OSAWATOMIE STATE HOSPITAL FD	OSAWATOMIE	913-755-7300	Tom Crozier	17	No
OTTAWA FIRE DEPARTMENT	OTTAWA	785-242-2561	Jeff Carner	19	No
OVERLAND PARK FIRE DEPT	OVERLAND PARK	913-888-6066	Mike Casey	126	Yes
PARSONS FIRE DEPARTMENT	PARSONS	316-421-7050	Tim Hay	19	No
PITTSBURG FIRE DEPARTMENT	PITTSBURG	316-231-1870	William J. Scott	34	No
POTAWATOMI TRIBAL FIRE DEPT	MAYETTA	785-966-2164	Brian Jones	16	No
SALINA FIRE DEPARTMENT	SALINA	785-826-7340	Steve Moody	90	No
SEDGWICK CO FIRE DIST #1	WICHITA	316-744-0471	David Matthew	140	No
SHAWNEE FIRE DEPARTMENT	SHAWNEE	913-631-1080	Jeffrey Hudson	43	No
TOPEKA FIRE DEPARTMENT	TOPEKA	785-368-4000	Jerry Kingsley	249	No




FIRE DEPARTMENT NAME	CITY	FD PHONE	Contact Person	#PAID FF	PIA SOG
WELLINGTON FIRE DEPARTMENT	WELLINGTON	316-326-7443	Gerald Templeton	17	No
WICHITA FIRE DEPARTMENT	WICHITA	316-268-4451	Ron Mies	377	Yes
WINFIELD FIRE DEPARTMENT	WINFIELD	316-221-5560	Gordon Dipple	20	Yes

## **APPENDIX D**

### **SEDGWICK COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS STANDARD OPERATING GUIDELINES**

**SEDGWICK COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT STANDARD OPERATING GUIDELINES**

	<b>Category</b> OPERATIONS	<b>S.O.G.: 5.7.1</b> <b>Page 1 of 2</b>
	<b>Subcategory</b>  GENERAL	<b>Submitted by:</b> <b>Captain David Matthew</b> <b>Approved by:</b>
	<b>Subject:</b> POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS	<b>Effective Date:</b>  <b>Revised Date:</b>
	<b>Refer to: ATTACHMENT 5.7.2</b>	

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of the Post Incident Analysis is to reinforce departmental procedures, identify successful actions taken, and to identify ways to improve the effectiveness of operations. All personnel must understand that discipline is not the purpose of the PIA.

**OBJECTIVES**

1. To set a positive atmosphere for the purpose of improving future operations.
2. To reconstruct the operations at an incident to determine the events that occurred, the strategy and tactics identified, the tasks chosen, and the results of the operation.
3. To create an environment that promotes improvement from analysis of what went wrong, and reinforce guidelines from analysis of what went right.

**SCOPE**

This SOG applies to all personnel.

**POLICY**

It is the policy of the Sedgwick County Fire Department to conduct a Post Incident Analysis of every incident involving the SCFD that has a major impact on the community, an incident involving a major response from the SCFD, or an incident that involves a unique response of the SCFD.

**GUIDELINE**

A chief officer may initiate a PIA, either by his/her own request or by a substantiated request of a subordinate.

The Safety/ Training Division will be in control of the PIA and will provide a facilitator, preferably a person that was not directly involved with the incident. A scribe will also be provided to document items discussed and lessons learned.

Attempts will be made to have all members of the SCFD that were involved in the incident participate in the PIA.

<b>SEDGWICK COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT STANDARD OPERATING GUIDELINES</b>	
<b>Subject:</b> POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS	<b>SOG: 5.7.1</b>
<b>Effective:</b>	<b>Page 2 of 2</b>

## **GUIDELINE**

Each participant will be asked the same questions by the facilitator, one at a time, based on arrival sequence. It is a good idea to write the questions being asked so the participant will stay on task.

**Question #1 – “Name and what unit you responded on?”**

**Question #2 – “What were you assigned, and what you did?”**

The previous questions are fact-based questions. It is important that the facilitator keep the participants from inserting opinions or editorials at this stage of the PIA.

**Question #3 – “What we could do better as a team?”**

As subjects are mentioned, it is open for the group to discuss. The facilitator should keep the group discussion to one subject at a time. Allow everyone the opportunity to express his or her concerns, ideas, praise, etc. Don't let a subject be repeatedly discussed. Cover the subject and move on.

Each participant is asked all of the questions. Generally on the third question, the sixth or seventh person will cover the majority of the subjects. Encourage the remaining participants, if they don't have a new subject, to state “I have nothing to add” or “it's been covered” etc.

It is the facilitator's responsibility to explain and enforce the ground rules. Stress throughout the PIA that this is a lesson's learned discussion. Encourage positive comments. Stress that this is not a critique, but that a critique may be conducted on an officer to crew level if called for.

Results from the PIA will be communicated to all personnel. SOG 5.7.2 forms will be completed and placed on file in the training division for future direction in training needs.

## **DISCUSSION**

The purpose of the PIA is to improve future operations, not to place blame. Any Disciplinary actions related to the incident should be handled prior to the PIA. The facilitator must keep the discussion productive and on task. If possible, a drawing of the scene and vehicle placement should be referenced during the PIA. Time management is critical. Keeping the PIA to less than 1 hour is desired. If the complexities and discussion warrant more time, a break should be provided.

### **Definitions:**

SCFD defines the Post Incident Analysis as a “lessons learned” discussion. A Critique is a critical look at the incident. In general, the PIA will be done in a large group setting controlled by a facilitator. The critique will be done in a small group setting, usually supervisor to subordinate. Both methods will be used by SCFD to improve future operations.

**Sedgwick County Fire Department  
Standard Operating Guidelines**

**SOG 5.7.2****POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS DATA SHEET**

Page 1 of 4

ALARM NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_ TIME \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION \_\_\_\_\_

INCIDENT COMMANDER \_\_\_\_\_ FIRST DUE UNIT \_\_\_\_\_ OTHER UNITS \_\_\_\_\_

TYPE OF INCIDENT: FIRE EMS HAZMAT OTHER \_\_\_\_\_

**I. COMMUNICATIONS**

a. GOOD INITIAL DISPATCH YES NO N/A

**II. SIZE UP**

a. DID FIRST ARRIVING UNIT GIVE SIZE UP? YES NO N/A

**III. INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM**

a. DID THE FIRST ARRIVING UNIT TAKE OR PASS COMMAND? YES NO N/A

b. WHAT MODE DID THE FIRST UNIT TAKE? \_\_\_\_\_

c. PROGRESS REPORTS GIVEN TO COMMAND? YES NO N/A

d. DID UNITS FOLLOW THEIR ASSIGNMENTS? YES NO N/A

e. WAS COMMAND CLEARLY IDENTIFIABLE? YES NO N/A

**IV. TACTICS AND STRATEGY**

a. WAS AN OVERALL STRATEGY ESTABLISHED? YES NO N/A

b. WERE GRP/DIV OFFICERS AWARE OF STRATEGY? YES NO N/A

c. WERE PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED? YES NO N/A

d. WERE OBJECTIVES GIVEN TO THE GPS/DIV? YES NO N/A

**V. INCIDENT TASKS (IF APPLICABLE)**

a. WAS PRIMARY SEARCH ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

b. WAS SECONDARY SEARCH ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

c. WAS ATTACK ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

d. WERE EXPOSURES ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

e. WAS VENTILATION ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

f. WAS SALVAGE ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

g. WAS AN INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED? YES NO N/A

h. WERE UTILITIES DISCONNECTED? YES NO N/A

i. WAS LIGHTING PROVIDED? YES NO N/A

j. WERE ADEQUATE LINES AND FLOW USED? YES NO N/A

k. WAS THE THERMAL IMAGER USED? YES NO N/A

l. WAS A TRIAGE ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

m. WAS EXTRICATION ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

n. WAS A LANDING ZONE ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

o. WAS SAFETY ASSIGNED? YES NO N/A

**Sedgwick County Fire Department  
Standard Operating Guidelines**

**SOG 5.7.2****POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS DATA SHEET**

Page 2 of 4

**VI. SAFETY**

a. WAS THERE FULL COMPLIANCE WITH PPE / BSI?	YES	NO	
b. WAS THERE FULL COMPLIANCE WITH SCBA?	YES	NO	N/A
c. WAS THERE COMPLIANCE WITH ALL SAFETY PRACTICES?	YES	NO	
d. EXTRICATION ISSUES?	YES	NO	N/A
e. STABILIZATION ISSUES?	YES	NO	N/A

**VII. EQUIPMENT**

a. DID APPARATUS FUNCTION AND OPERATE PROPERLY?	YES	NO	
b. DID ALL SCBA FUNCTION PROPERLY?	YES	NO	N/A
c. DID ALL HOSE AND APPLIANCES FUNCTION?	YES	NO	N/A
d. DID ALL MISCELANEOUS EQUIPMENT FUNCTION?	YES	NO	

**VIII. COMMAND REPORTS**

a. WAS MODE CLEARLY TRANSMITTED?	YES	NO	N/A
b. WAS SEARCH MODE CLEARLY TRANSMITTED?	YES	NO	N/A
c. WAS ALL CLEAR TRANSMITTED?	YES	NO	N/A
d. WAS UNDER CONTROL TRANSMITTED?	YES	NO	N/A
e. WAS TACTICAL WORKSHEET USED?	YES	NO	N/A
f. WAS TRIAGE REPORT TRANSMITTED?	YES	NO	N/A

**IX. APPARATUS PLACEMENT**

a. DID FIRST DUE UNIT POSITION WELL?	YES	NO	
b. DID UNITS FOLLOW LEVEL I STAGING PROCEDURES?	YES	NO	N/A
c. DID UNITS FOLLOW LEVEL II STAGING PROCEDURES?	YES	NO	N/A
d. DID UNITS POSITION WELL FOR OPERATIONS?	YES	NO	

**X. OTHER SERVICES, TRAFFIC AND CROWD CONTROL**

a. DID POLICE PROVIDE GOOD TRAFFIC CONTROL?	YES	NO	N/A
b. DID POLICE PROVIDE GOOD CROWD CONTROL?	YES	NO	N/A
c. WAS SCENE TAPE UTILIZED?	YES	NO	N/A
d. DID POLICE/EMS INTERACT WITH COMMAND?	YES	NO	N/A
e. DID POLICE/EMS USE GOOD VEHICLE PLACEMENT?	YES	NO	N/A

**XI. STAFFING**

a. WAS ON SCENE STAFFING ADEQUATE?	YES	NO	N/A
b. WAS EFFECTIVE REHAB AVAILABLE?	YES	NO	N/A
c. DID PERSONNEL WORK AS UNITS?	YES	NO	N/A
d. WAS STAFFING ADEQUATE FOR RESOURCES?	YES	NO	N/A

[illegible]

**Sedgwick County Fire Department  
Standard Operating Guidelines**

**SOG 5.7.2**

**POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS DATA SHEET**

Page 4 of 4

**TACTICAL DEPLOYMENT**



**N**